DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of

Procedures for Reviewing Requests for Relief From State and Local Regulations Pursuant to Section 332(c)(7)(B)(v) of the Communications Act of 1934 MA'L ROOM WT Docket No. 97 197 10 1397 97-192

Kinggradi, Lincoln Science

ECEIVED

COMMENTS

I oppose the Commission's proposal to further limit the right of states and local governments to protect my health.

Under Sec. 253 of the Communications Act, states and local governments are guaranteed the right to protect the public safety and welfare. They therefore must be able to seek whatever information they deem necessary from personal wireless service providers to enforce the Commission's safety regulations. I oppose restricting access to information, and I oppose the adoption of a rebuttable presumption of compliance.

I also oppose the Commission's proposed intrusion into the affairs of private entities such as homeowner associations and private land covenants who may not want communications equipment on their premises. And I oppose the request of the Personal Communications Industry Association to prohibit private citizens from testifying about health effects at local zoning board hearings! There is nothing in the Telecommunications Act which gives the Commission the right to interfere with the decisions of private citizens.

Octobe 6,1997
(Date)
No. of Copies rec's
List ABOUE

Respectfully submitted,
Peter Hudiburg
8645 20th ave Papt 46
Brooklyn, ny 1/2/4
(Name
Address 7/8 449-694/
Phone)

From: Arthur Firstenberg

To: Cellular Phone Taskforce meeting

Date: Sept. 7, 1997

The FCC is taking comments from the public in the following matter:

In Feb. 1996 Congress passed the Telecommunications Act, which preempts states and local governments from regulating personal wireless services on the basis of their environmental effects. On Aug. 6, 1996 the FCC issued federal safety regulations beyond which states and local governments aren't permitted to go. Now the FCC is proposing to limit our rights even further. In a document released August 25, 1997, the FCC states: "We are concerned that state and local governments may delay the siting of facilities based on concerns about the effects of RF emissions and a carrier's compliance with our RF guidelines." The FCC is proposing:

- 1. that "there should be some limit as to the type of information that a state or local government may seek from a personal wireless service provider."
- 2. that "a uniform demonstration of compliance should consist of a written statement," and that states and cities not be allowed to demand anything more.
- 3. that the burden of proof rests on states and local governments and not on the companies: "Generally, we presume that licensees are in compliance with our rules unless presented with evidence to the contrary." This is called a "rebuttable presumption of compliance."
- 4. that the FCC be allowed to preempt private entities "such as homeowner associations and private land covenants" from keeping antennas off their own land for health reasons.
- 5. that the FCC also be allowed to preempt decisions that are only partially based on environmental reasons.
- 6. In addition, the FCC is considering the request of the Personal Communications Industry Association (PCIA) to prohibit the public from testifying about health effects at local zoning board hearings.

The deadline for public comment is Oct. 9, 1997. An original and 4 copies must be sent to the Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222, Washington, DC 20554. Normally the FCC does not receive many comments from the general public. What say we inundate them? I have composed a sample that may be used.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR FOOM

In the Matter of

(10 1)

WT Docke From WENT

Procedures for Reviewing Requests for Relief From State and Local Regulations Pursuant to Section 332(c)(7)(B)(v) of the Communications Act of 1934

97-192

refreshiological

COMMENTS

I oppose the Commission's proposal to further limit the right of states and local governments to protect my health.

Under Sec. 253 of the Communications Act, states and local governments are guaranteed the right to protect the public safety and welfare. They therefore must be able to seek whatever information they deem necessary from personal wireless service providers to enforce the Commission's safety regulations. I oppose restricting access to information, and I oppose the adoption of a rebuttable presumption of compliance.

I also oppose the Commission's proposed intrusion into the affairs of private entities such as homeowner associations and private land covenants who may not want communications equipment on their premises. And I oppose the request of the Personal Communications Industry Association to prohibit private citizens from testifying about health effects at local zoning board hearings! There is nothing in the Telecommunications Act which gives the Commission the right to interfere with the decisions of private citizens.

Detable 6, 1997

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Hudiburg

P.O. Box 61

South Plymouth, ny 13844

(Name 607 334-2986

Address

Phone)

From: Arthur Firstenberg

To: Cellular Phone Taskforce meeting

Date: Sept. 7, 1997

The FCC is taking comments from the public in the following matter:

In Feb. 1996 Congress passed the Telecommunications Act, which preempts states and local governments from regulating personal wireless services on the basis of their environmental effects. On Aug. 6, 1996 the FCC issued federal safety regulations beyond which states and local governments aren't permitted to go. Now the FCC is proposing to limit our rights even further. In a document released August 25, 1997, the FCC states: "We are concerned that state and local governments may delay the siting of facilities based on concerns about the effects of RF emissions and a carrier's compliance with our RF guidelines." The FCC is proposing:

- l. that "there should be some limit as to the type of information that a state or local government may seek from a personal wireless service provider."
- 2. that "a uniform demonstration of compliance should consist of a written statement," and that states and cities not be allowed to demand anything more.
- 3. that the burden of proof rests on states and local governments and not on the companies: "Generally, we presume that licensees are in compliance with our rules unless presented with evidence to the contrary." This is called a "rebuttable presumption of compliance."
- 4. that the FCC be allowed to preempt private entities "such as homeowner associations and private land covenants" from keeping antennas off their own land for health reasons.
- 5. that the FCC also be allowed to preempt decisions that are only partially based on environmental reasons.
- 6. In addition, the FCC is considering the request of the Personal Communications Industry Association (PCIA) to prohibit the public from testifying about health effects at local zoning board hearings.

The deadline for public comment is Oct. 9, 1997. An original and 4 copies must be sent to the Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222, Washington, DC 20554. Normally the FCC does not receive many comments from the general public. What say we inundate them? I have composed a sample that may be used.